

Comments on the proposed conservation of ARANEIDAE Clerck, 1758, *Araneus* Clerck, 1758 and *Tegenaria* Latreille, 1804 (Arachnida, Araneae)
(Case 3371: see BZN 64: 15–18)

(1) Peter Jäger

*Sektion Arachnologie, Forschungsinstitut und Naturmuseum Senckenberg,
Senckenberganlage 25, D-60325 Frankfurt, Germany*
(e-mail: Peter.Jaeger@Senckenberg.de)

I fully agree with the statements and proposals made in this application. I support the proposal, as the generic names *Araneus* and *Tegenaria* are very widely used and any other ruling would cause terrible and unnecessary confusion. Moreover, the solution proposed fully conforms to the presumed intentions of the original authors.

(2) O. Kraus

*Zoological Institute & Zoological Museum, University of Hamburg,
Martin-Luther-King-Platz 3, D-20146 Hamburg, Germany*
(e-mail: Otto.Kraus@zoologie.uni-hamburg.de)

I strongly support N.J. Kluge's application. This is in conformity with current usage. His proposals will prevent further useless digging in old works.

(3) Herbert W. Levi

*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, 26 Oxford Street,
Cambridge, MA 02138–2902, U.S.A.* (e-mail: levi@fas.harvard.edu)

Forty years ago I was unsuccessful finding a designated type species for the genus *Aranea* and designated *A. diadema* L. as type (Levi, 1971, p. 133). It was overlooked by Kluge (Kluge, personal communication). I think this type designation solves the hypothetical problem presented by Kluge (Case 3371). There is no objection to having similar generic names *Aranea* and *Araneus*, *Aranea* now a synonym of *Araneus*. The type species of both genera are much alike. Problems of hypothetical family names based on similar generic names have been solved in the past.

Latreille's type designation (and I have not checked on this), forgotten for 200 years, could be annulled, but both the Preamble of the Code and General Recommendations of the Code stress stability of Nomenclature, not searching for obsolete names, making the use of this old type designation unlikely. I do not think that there is a nomenclatural problem.

Additional reference

Levi, H.W. 1971. The *diadematus* group of the orb-weaver genus *Araneus* North of Mexico (Araneae: Araneidae). *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology*, **141**(4): 131–179.

(4) Nikita J. Kluge

Department of Entomology, St. Petersburg State University, 195213 St. Petersburg, Russia (e-mail: kluge@FK13889.spb.edu)

The type designation made by Levi (1971) is invalid, because it ignores the earlier type designation made by Latreille (1810). Levi (1971) suggested that *Aranea diadema* be designated as the type species of *Aranea* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Araneus angulatus* is confirmed as the type species of *Araneus* Clerk, 1758. If this approach was followed, *Aranea* would become an older objective synonym of *Epeira* Walckenaer, 1805 and a junior subjective synonym of *Araneus* Clerk, 1758. The purpose of this action is unclear, as both species are considered to belong to the same genus. If in the future the recently accepted large genus *Araneus* is subdivided into smaller genera in such a manner that the species presently identified as *Araneus angulatus* and *Araneus diadema* will fall into different genera, these genera will get the hardly distinguishable names *Araneus* and *Aranea* respectively, instead of the distinct names *Araneus* and *Epeira*. If these taxa are elevated to the family-group rank, their names will become identical, and a new ruling by Commission will be necessary. The suggestion made by Levi (1971) does not clarify the situation with the recently used family name ARANEIDAE Latreille, 1806. When the family-group name ARANEIDAE was established, its type genus *Aranea* was interpreted as being based on *Aranea domestica* (which was subsequently designated as the type species by Latreille (1810)). This interpretation of *Aranea* is different from that based on the type species proposed by Levi (1971).

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Termes serratus* Froggatt, 1898 (currently *Microcerotermes serratus*) and *Termes serrula* Desneux, 1904 (currently *Microcerotermes serrula*) (Insecta, Isoptera, TERMITINAE)
(Case 3385; see BZN 64: 83–86, 185–187)

David T. Jones

Department of Entomology, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e-mail: dtj@nhm.ac.uk)

The specific name *Microcerotermes serratus* (Froggatt, 1898) has been used since its publication to refer to an Australian termite, while the specific name *M. serrula* (Desneux, 1904) has been used since its publication to refer to a species from Southeast Asia. Because both names are invalid, Roisin & Pasteels (2000, p. 165) recommended the strict application of the Code to correct these names, which would necessitate the Southeast Asian species being called *M. serratus* (Haviland, 1898), and the Australian species being called *M. parviceps* Mjöberg, 1920. Roisin & Pasteels (BZN 64: 186) are correct in their assumption that I overlooked this recommendation (Roisin & Pasteels, 2000, p. 165), with the result that I continued to follow the prevailing trend and used the junior names. In 2006, on reading their correction, I applied for the conservation of both junior names (Case 3385; BZN 64: 83–86), an application that Roisin & Pasteels wish the Commission to reject (BZN 64: 185–187). My application cannot be described as ‘nomenclatural anarchy’ (Roisin & Pasteels, BZN 64: 187), as an application to the Commission asking for their ruling on this matter is the official method for resolving such disagreements over nomenclature.

I have found six additional publications (Gay, 1952, p. 127; Gay, 1956, p. 211; Ferrar & Watson, 1970, p. 101; Grassé, 1982, p. 614; Grassé, 1984, p. 243; Watson & Gay, 1991, p. 346) using the name *M. serratus* (Froggatt, 1898). This brings the number of publications citing this name in the fifty years immediately preceding Roisin & Pasteels's (2000) correction to 13. These 13 publications have more than five different authors, and thus the criteria for conserving this name (Article 79(c) of the 3rd edition of the Code, which was still current when Roisin & Pasteels submitted their correction for publication) would have been met. I have also found five additional publications (Tho, 1982, p. 185; Collins, 1984, p. 70; Chey, 1989, p. 101; Ahmad & Akhtar, 2002, p. 58; Houseman, 2004, p. 237) using the name *M. serrula* (Desneux, 1904), bringing the number of publications citing this name during the same period to seven.

Roisin & Pasteels (BZN 64: 185–187) disagree with my assertions that these two junior names are now 'widely accepted and extensively used' and 'well known' (BZN 64: 84–85). While I acknowledge that the number of publications using these names is relatively low, I would argue that my assertions are justified within the context of termite research for the following reasons:

- (1) These names have been accepted and used by everyone who has published anything on these species, including all the recognised termite experts (Silvestri, Mjöberg, Hill, Gay, Watson, Miller, Grassé, Ahmad, Tho and Thapa) who have published on the Australian or Southeast Asian fauna. The only exceptions are Holmgren (1911), who subsequently adopted the use of the junior name in 1913, and Roisin & Pasteels (2000).
- (2) The junior name *M. serratus* (Froggatt, 1898) has been used in every major publication on the termite fauna of Australia: *Termites (Isoptera) from the Australian region* (Hill, 1942), *Termites of the Australian region* (Gay & Calaby, 1970), *The insects of Australia* (Watson & Gay, 1991), *Atlas of Australia termites* (Watson & Abbey, 1993) and the *Zoological catalogue of Australia* (Watson et al., 1998). In regard to the Southeast Asian fauna, there are only two major publications available, *Termites of Peninsular Malaysia* (Tho, 1992) and *Termites of Sabah* (Thapa, 1981), and both of these use the junior name *M. serrula* (Desneux, 1904).
- (3) Those of us who work on the termites of Southeast Asia or Australia are familiar with these widespread species because they are well documented in the literature as part of their respective regional fauna, and in the case of *M. serrula* (Desneux, 1904) because it is often abundant on the forest floor and easily recognized due to the relatively short, stout mandibles of the soldiers.

Roisin & Pasteels's desire to reject the application and to revert to the valid names ignores a huge potential cause of confusion. Everyone who studies either the Southeast Asian or the Australian fauna relies on the major publications listed above, all of which use the junior names. Also, any new researchers starting in either region will immediately turn to those same obvious sources for an authoritative view of the fauna. They might not consult a paper from an adjoining region entitled '*The genus Microcerotermes (Isoptera: Termitidae) in New Guinea and the Solomon Islands*', and thus Roisin & Pasteels's (2000) correction would go unnoticed. Reverting to the correct names would render all those major publications inaccurate. However, those publications will continue to be consulted, with the likely result that the junior names will continue to be used and published.

To reject the application and revert to the correct names may satisfy the letter of the Code but it would: (1) require overturning the prevailing usage of the junior names, (2) leave all the major publications from both regions with a nomenclatural inaccuracy, which is likely to be perpetuated in the future literature, and (3) cause confusion over species distributions because of the switching of the binomen *Microcerotermes serratus* from an Australian species to a Southeast Asian species. A ruling to conserve the junior names would cause no such problems but instead would legitimise the use of the currently accepted names, protect the accuracy of the major regional publications, and ensure nomenclatural stability.

Additional references

- Ahmad, M. & Akhtar, M.S. 2002. Catalogue of the termites (Isoptera) of the Oriental region. *Pakistan Journal of Zoology Supplement Series*, **2**: 1–86.
- Chey, V.K. 1989. A survey of termites in Sabah Forests. *FSC Publication*, **1/89**: 1–144. Forest Research Centre, Sandakan.
- Collins, N.M. 1984. The termites (Isoptera) of the Gunung Mulu National Park with a key to the genera known from Sarawak. *Sarawak Museum Journal*, **30**: 65–87.
- Ferrar, P. & Watson, J.A.L. 1970. Termites (Isoptera) associated with dung in Australia. *Journal of the Australian Entomological Society*, **9**: 100–102.
- Gay, F.J. 1952. A rare termite intercaste. *Australian Journal of Science*, **14**: 127–128.
- Gay, F.J. 1956. New species of termites from Australia. *Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales*, **80**: 207–213.
- Grassé, P.-P. 1982. *Termitologia, tome 1: anatomie, physiologie, reproduction*. 676 pp. Masson, Paris.
- Grassé, P.-P. 1984. *Termitologia, tome 2: foundation des sociétés, construction*. 613 pp. Masson, Paris.
- Houseman, R.M. 2004. First record of *Microcerotermes serrula* (Desneux) (Isoptera: Termitidae) in Thailand. *Entomological News*, **115**: 327–239.
- Tho, Y.P. 1982. Gap formation by the termite *Microcerotermes dubius* in lowland forests of Peninsular Malaysia. *The Malaysian Forester*, **45**: 184–192.
- Watson, J.A.L. & Gay, F.J. 1991. Isoptera (Termites). Pp. 330–347 in: *The Insects of Australia*, by Division of Entomology, CSIRO. Melbourne University Press.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific names *Hemerobius elegans* Stephens, 1836 (currently *Symphorobius elegans*) and *Hemerobius elegans* Guérin-Méneville, 1844 (currently *Vieira elegans*) (Insecta, Neuroptera)
(Case 3392; see BZN **64**: 174–177)

Catherine A. Tauber

Department of Entomology, Comstock Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853–2601, U.S.A. (e-mail: cat6@cornell.edu)

I strongly support John Oswald's application to conserve the specific names *Hemerobius elegans* Stephens, 1836 and *Hemerobius elegans* Guérin-Méneville, 1844 for two species of lacewings in separate, well-recognized families. The duplication of names has not led to any confusion for over 150 years, and there is not even a remote likelihood that it would do so in the future. In contrast, suppression of the junior homonym would require additional name changes in a small genus that has already undergone several recent alterations. For stability and simplicity, I urge the

Commission to use its plenary power to conserve the junior homonym and place both names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the ichnogenus *Coprinisphaera* Sauer, 1955 (Ichnotaxa, Insecta, Coleoptera, COPRINISPHAERIDAE)

(Case 3360; see BZN 63: 243–246)

(1) Frank-Thorsten Krell

*Department of Zoology, Denver Museum of Nature & Science,
2001 Colorado Boulevard, Denver, CO 80205–5798, U.S.A.*

(e-mail: Frank.Krell@dmns.org)

Genise et al. (BZN 63: 243–246) proposed the conservation of the ichnogeneric name *Coprinisphaera* Sauer, 1955 by suppressing the senior synonym *Fontanai* Roselli, 1939. I fully support that *Coprinisphaera* should be used as the valid name for the fossil dung balls. It is not only a widely used name in ichnotaxonomy but has entered the geological literature also by naming the ‘*Coprinisphaera* ichnofacies’ as already documented by Genise et al. (BZN 63: 243–246) and complemented by the following references: Sauer (1965, pp. 271–272), Martinez (1982, p. 48), Genise & Bown (1994, p. 109), Hasiotis et al. (1994, fig. 149), Genise & Cladera (1995, p. 78), Genise & Laza (1998, p. 220), González et al. (1998), Genise (2000a, pp. 50, 53, 55; 2000b, p. 28; 2000c, p. 115), Buatois et al. (2000), Verde (2000, pp. 112–113), Genise et al. (2001), Hasiotis (2002, pp. 79–80, 132), Genise (2003, p. 19), Bellosi et al. (2004, pp. 33, 35), Buatois & Mángano (2004, pp. 312, 327), Dieni & Genise (2004a, p. 29; 2004b, p. 31), Genise & Cladera (2004, pp. 632, 636), Genise et al. (2004b), Genise & Bellosi (2004, p. 41), Hasiotis (2004, pp. 184–185, 188, 190, 200, 236, 238, 239, 250), Hembree & Hasiotis (2004), Bellosi et al. (2005), Radies et al. (2005, pp. 116–118), Sánchez et al. (2005), Chure et al. (2006, p. 243), Hasiotis (2006, p. 401), Hasiotis & Bourke (2006, pp. 217–218), Sánchez et al. (2006; 2007), Bromley et al. (2007, pp. 144, 146), Buatois & Mángano (2007, pp. 286–289, 315); Durringer et al. (2007, pp. 333, 350), Ekdale et al. (2007, p. 570), Genise (2007), Hasiotis (2007, p. 265), Hasiotis et al. (2007, pp. 174, 182, 192), Hunt & Lucas (2007, pp. 59–60, 63), Krause et al. (2007), Krell (2007, p. 3), MacEachern et al. (2007a, pp. 54–58, 61; 2007b, p. 114), Melchor et al. (2007, p. 16), Verde & Genise (2007), Verde et al. (2007, pp. 342–343); with the secondary incorrect spelling *Coprinsphaera*: Halffter & Matthews (1966, p. 154), Retallack (1991, pp. 182, 296), Durringer et al. (2000, p. 264). It would be confusing if the *Coprinisphaera* ichnofacies was defined by an ichnogenus with a different name.

The senior subjective synonym *Fontanai* Roselli is still in use (Buatois & Mángano 2007, 288; MacEachern et al. 2007, 58), but these authors did not consider its synonymy with *Coprinisphaera* proposed by González et al. (1998) and Laza (2006). Both names were mentioned as valid ichnogenera. *Fontanai* has never been used as a valid senior synonym of *Coprinisphaera*.

Dealing with non-organic entities without tokogenetic or phylogenetic relationships and poor in characters, ichnotaxonomy is notoriously difficult and subjective. It is current understanding by many ichnologists that ‘producer-based criteria, as such [...] may not be considered relevant for ichnotaxonomy, because the assignment

generally is too ambiguous' (Bertling et al., 2006). Ichnotaxonomy is at a stage of structural typology. With increasing ichnotaxonomical knowledge and new finds the assignment of traces to trace-makers might become more reliable and eventually an accepted ichnotaxonomical criterion. Currently I consider it rash to suppress a subjective senior synonym in ichnology because it might represent a distinct ichnotaxon in a future refined ichnotaxonomy. Therefore I suggest the modification of the application by Genise et al. (BZN 63: 244) and ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

- (1) to use its plenary power to give the name *Coprinisphaera* Sauer, 1955 precedence over the name *Fontanai* Roselli, 1939, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Coprinisphaera* Sauer, 1955 (gender: feminine), with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the name *Fontanai* Roselli, 1939 whenever the two are considered to be synonyms, type ichnospecies by monotypy *Coprinisphaera ecuadoriensis* Sauer, 1955;
- (3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *ecuadoriensis* Sauer, 1955, as published in the binomen *Coprinisphaera ecuadoriensis* (specific name of the type ichnospecies of *Coprinisphaera* Sauer, 1955).

I do not ask for *Fontanai* Roselli to be placed on the Official List because it should currently not be used as a valid genus-group name. Names that should not be used as valid should not be on the Official List. Putting *Fontanaichnus* Roselli, 1976 (junior objective synonym of *Fontanai* Roselli, 1939) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology as asked for by Genise et al. in (4)(b) (BZN 63: 244) is appropriate but unnecessary because it is a junior objective synonym anyway.

Additional references

- Bellosi, E.S., Genise, J.F., Laza, J.H. & Sánchez, M.V. 2005. Terrestrial trace fossils and ichnostratigraphy of the Sarmiento Formation: implications for the oldest grass-dominated ecosystem. *Actas del XVI Congreso Geológico Argentino, La Plata* 306.
- Bellosi, E.S., González, M.G. & Genise, J.F. 2004. Origen y desmantelamiento de lateritas paleógenas del sudoeste de Uruguay (Formación Asencio). *Revista del Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales, n.s.*, 6: 25–40.
- Bertling, M., Braddy, S.J., Bromley, R.G., Demathieu, G.R., Genise, J., Mikuláš, R., Nielsen, J.K., Nielsen, K.S.S., Rindsberg, A.K., Schlirf, M. & Uchman, A. 2006. Names for trace fossils: a uniform approach. *Lethaia*, 39: 256–286.
- Bromley, R.G., Buatois, L.A., Genise, J.F., Labandeira, C.G., Mángano, M.G., Melchor, R.N., Schlirf, M. & Uchman, A. 2007. Comments on the paper "Reconnaissance of Upper Jurassic Morrison Formation ichnofossils, Rocky Mountain Region, USA: Paleoenvironmental, stratigraphic, and paleoclimatic significance of terrestrial and freshwater ichnocoenoses" by Stephen T. Hasiotis. *Sedimentary Geology*, 200: 141–150.
- Buatois, L.A. & Mángano, M.G. 2004. Animal-substrate interactions in freshwater environments: applications of ichnology in facies and sequence stratigraphic analysis of fluvio-lacustrine successions. Pp. 311–333 in D. McIlroy (Ed.), *The Application of Ichnology to Palaeoenvironmental and Stratigraphic Analysis*. Geological Society, London.
- Buatois, L.A. & Mángano, M.G. 2007. Invertebrate ichnology of continental freshwater environments. Pp. 285–323 in Miller, W. (Ed.), *Trace Fossils. Concepts, Problems, Prospects*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.

- Buatois, L.A., Mánagno, M.G. & Genise, J.F.** 2000. Ichnofacies models in continental environments. *Abstracts of the 31st International Geological Congress, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, August 2000* [CD-ROM].
- Chure, D.J., Litwin, R., Hasiotis, S.T., Evanoff, E. & Carpenter, K.** 2006. The fauna and flora of the Morrison Formation: 2006. *New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin*, **36**: 233–249.
- Dieni, I. & Genise, J.** 2004a. Il primo ritrovamento [europeo] di *Coprinisphaera* Sauer, 1955 (nidi fossili di Scarabei stercorari) nell'Eocene dell'Italia NE. *Giornate di Paleontologia 2004, Bolzano, 21–23 Maggio, Riassunti e Elenco Partecipanti*.
- Dieni, I. & Genise, J.** 2004b. The first European record of *Coprinisphaera* Sauer, 1955. *Ichnia 2004, First International Congress on Ichnology, April 19–23, 2004. Museo Paleontológico Egidio Feruglio, Trelew, Patagonia Argentina. Abstract Book*: 31.
- Duringer, P., Brunet, M., Cambefort, Y., Beauvilain, A., Mackaye, H.T., Vignaud, P. & Schuster, M.** 2000. Des boules de bousiers fossiles et leurs terriers dans les sites à Australopithèques du Pliocène tchadien. *Bulletin de la Société géologique de France*, **171**: 259–269.
- Duringer, P., Schuster, M., Genise, J.F., Mackaye, H.T., Vignaud, P. & Brunet, M.** 2007. New termite trace fossils: Galleries, nests and fungus combs from the Chad basin of Africa (Upper Miocene–Lower Pliocene). *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **251**: 323–353.
- Ekdale, A.A., Bromley, R.G. & Loope, D.B.** 2007. Ichnofacies of an ancient erg: a climatically influenced trace fossil association in the Jurassic Navajo Sandstone, Southern Utah, USA. Pp. 562–576 in Miller, W. (Ed.), *Trace Fossils. Concepts, Problems, Prospects*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Genise, J.F.** 2000a. Nidos fósiles de insectos en paleosuelos. Pp. 46–60 in Buatois, L.A., Genise, J., Mánagno, M.G., Muñoz, N., Netto, R.G. & Poiré, D.G. (Eds.), *II Congreso Latinoamericano de Sedimentología, VIII Reunión Argentina de Sedimentología, Curso de Actualización. Icnología: aplicaciones en la geología sedimentaria y la industria petrolera*. Mar del Plata, Argentina.
- Genise, J.F.** 2000b. Insect paleoichnology in South America: past and present. *Abstracts, I Simpósio Brasileiro de Paleoartropodologia, I Simpósio Sudamericano de Paleoartropodologia, I International Meeting on Palearthropodology, Ribeirão Preto – SP, Brazil 3–8.9.2000*. Pages 28–29.
- Genise, J.F.** 2000c. Insect fossil nests. *Abstracts, I Simpósio Brasileiro de Paleoartropodologia, I Simpósio Sudamericano de Paleoartropodologia, I International Meeting on Palearthropodology, Ribeirão Preto – SP, Brazil 3–8.9.2000*. Pages 114–115.
- Genise, J.F.** 2003. The palaeontological significance of insect trace fossils in palaeosols. *FossilsX3. Programme and Abstracts, 3rd International Congress of Palaeoentomology with 2nd International Meeting on Palaearthropodology and 2nd World Congress on Amber and its Inclusions, 7th to 11th February 2003, Pretoria, South Africa*. Pages 18–19.
- Genise, J.F.** 2007. Icnología: el estudio integrado de trazas actuales y fósiles de insectos. *Resúmenes de la Quinta Reunión Argentina de Icnología y Tercera Reunión de Icnología del Mercosur. Ushuaia, Tierra del Fuego, Argentina*: 12.
- Genise, J.F. & Bellosi, E.S.** 2004. Continental trace fossils of the Laguna Palacios Formation (Upper Cretaceous) from the San Bernardo Range (Chubut Province). Pp. 33–43 in Bellosi, E.S. & Melchor, R.N. (Eds.), *Ichnia 2004, First International Congress on Ichnology, Fieldtrip Guidebook*. Museo Paleontológico Egidio Feruglio, Trelew, Argentina.
- Genise, J.F. & Bown, T.M.** 1994. New Miocene scarabeid and hymenopterous nests and Early Miocene (Santacrucian) paleoenvironments, Patagonian Argentina. *Ichnos*, **3**: 107–117.
- Genise, J.F. & Cladera, G.** 1995. Application of computerized tomography to study insect traces. *Ichnos*, **4**: 77–81.
- Genise, J.F. & Cladera, G.** 2004. *Chubutolithes gaimanensis* and other wasp trace fossils: breaking through the taphonomic barrier. *Journal of the Kansas Entomological Society*, **77**: 626–638.

- Genise, J.F. & Laza, J.H. 1998. *Monesichnus ameghinoi* Roselli: a complex insect trace fossil produced by two distinct trace makers. *Ichnos*, **5**: 213–223.
- Genise, J.F., Cladera, G. & Tancroff, S. 2001. La presencia de *Eatonichnus claronensis* en el Paleoceno del Chubut (Argentina). *IV Reunión Argentina de Icnología y Segunda Reunión de Icnología del Mercosur, Septiembre de 2001, Tucuman, Argentina*: 45.
- Genise, J.F., Mángano, M.G. & Buatois, L.A. 2004b. Ichnology moving out of the water: a model for terrestrial ichnofacies. *Abstract Book, First International Congress on Ichnology, April 2004, Trelew, Argentina*: 38.
- González, M., Tófalo, O.R. & Pazos, P. 1998. Icnología y paleosuelos del miembro Del Palacio de la formación Asencio (Cretácico Superior-Terciario Inferior) del Uruguay. *Actas, II Congreso Uruguayo de Geología, Punta del Este*. 38–42.
- Halffter, G. & Matthews, E.G. 1966. The natural history of dung beetles of the subfamily Scarabaeinae (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae). *Folia Entomologica Mexicana*, **12–14**: 1–312.
- Hasiotis, S.T. 2002. *Continental Trace Fossils. SEPM (Society for Sedimentary Geology) Short Course Notes*, **51**: ii, 132 pp.
- Hasiotis, S.T. 2004. Reconnaissance of Upper Jurassic Morrison Formation ichnofossils, Rocky Mountain Region, USA: paleoenvironmental, stratigraphic, and paleoclimatic significance of terrestrial and freshwater ichnocoenoses. *Sedimentary Geology*, **167**: 177–268.
- Hasiotis, S.T. 2006. [Book review of:] The Application of Ichnology to Palaeoenvironmental and Stratigraphic Analysis, D. McIlroy, ed., 2004, The Geological Society of London Special Publication 228, 490 pp. [...]. *Palaios*, **21**: 401–402.
- Hasiotis, S.T. 2007. Continental ichnology: fundamental processes and controls on trace fossil distribution. Pp. 262–278 in Miller, W. (Ed.), *Trace Fossils. Concepts, Problems, Prospects*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Hasiotis, S.T. & Bourke, M.C. 2006. Continental trace fossils and museum exhibits: displaying organism behaviour frozen in time. *The Geological Curator*, **8**: 211–226.
- Hasiotis, S.T., Bown [‘Brown’ on cover], T.M. & Abston, C. 1994. Photoglossary of marine and continental ichnofossils. *US. Geological Survey Digital Data Series*, **23**. [CD-ROM]
- Hasiotis, S.T., Kraus, M.J. & Demko, T.M. 2007. Climatic controls on continental trace fossils. Pp. 172–195 in Miller, W. (Ed.), *Trace Fossils. Concepts, Problems, Prospects*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Hembree, D.L. & Hasiotis, S.T. 2004. Using paleosols and ichnofossils to interpret the changing paleoecology, paleoenvironments, and paleoclimate of the Eocene-Oligocene White River Formation, northeastern Colorado. *Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programme*, **36(5)**: 63.
- Hunt, A.P. & Lucas, S.G. 2007. Tetrapod ichnofacies: A new paradigm. *Ichnos*, **14**: 59–68.
- Krause, J.M., Bellosi, E.S. & Genise, J.F. 2007. Evolucion de la icnofauna terrestre de la Patagonia Central II. El grupo Rio Chico: desde el E-T hasta la explosión del Eoceno medio. *Resúmenes de la Quinta Reunión Argentina de Icnología y Tercera Reunión de Icnología del Mercosur. Ushuaia, Tierra del Fuego, Argentina*: 38.
- Krell, F.-T. 2007. Catalogue of fossil Scarabaeoidea (Coleoptera: Polyphaga) of the Mesozoic and Tertiary – Version 2007 –. *Denver Museum of Nature and Science Technical Report*, **2007–8**: 68.
- MacEachern, J.A., Pemberton, S.G., Gingras, M.K. & Bann, K.L. 2007a. The ichnofacies paradigm: a fifty-year retrospective. Pp. 52–77 in Miller, W. (Ed.), *Trace Fossils. Concepts, Problems, Prospects*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- MacEachern, J.A., Pemberton, S.G., Gingras, M.K., Bann, K.L. & Dafoe, L.T. 2007b. Uses of trace fossils in genetic stratigraphy. Pp. 110–134 in Miller, W. (Ed.), *Trace Fossils. Concepts, Problems, Prospects*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Martinez, S. 1982. Catalogo sistematico de los insectos fósiles de América del Sur. *Revista de la Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias, Serie Ciencias de la Tierra*, **1**: 29–83.
- Melchor, R.N., Genise, J.F. & Miquel, S.E. 2002. Ichnology, sedimentology and paleontology of Eocene calcareous paleosols from a palustrine sequence, Argentina. *Palaios*, **17**: 16–35.

- Radies, D., Hasiotis, S.T., Preusser, F., Neubert, E. & Matter, A.** 2005. Paleoclimatic significance of Early Holocene faunal assemblages in wet interdune deposits of the Wahiba Sand Sea, Sultanate of Oman. *Journal of Arid Environments*, **62**: 109–125.
- Retallack, G.** 1991. *Miocene Paleosols and Ape Habitats of Pakistan and Kenya*. viii, 346 pp. Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press, New York and Oxford.
- Sánchez, M.V., Bellosi, E.S., Laza, J.H. & Genise, J.F.** 2007. Evolución de la icnofauna terrestre de la Patagonia central V. Formación Sarmiento, la explosión del Eoceno medio. *Resúmenes de la Quinta Reunión Argentina de Icnología y Tercera Reunión de Icnología del Mercosur. Ushuaia, Tierra del Fuego, Argentina*: 41.
- Sánchez, M.V., Laza, J.H., Bellosi, E.S. & Genise, J.F.** 2005. Comparación preliminar del registro fósil e icnofósil de Scarabaeinae (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). *Libro de Resúmenes, VI Congreso Argentino de Entomología, San Miguel de Tucumán, 12 al 15 de Septiembre de 2005*. Page 120.
- Sánchez, M.V., Laza, J.H., Bellosi, E.S. & Genise, J.F.** 2006. The integration of ichnofossil and body fossil records in Scarabaeinae (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). *Resúmenes de la VII Reunión Latinoamericana de Scarabaeoidología, 13–16 Noviembre de 2006, Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia*. 20.
- Sauer, W.** 1965. *Geología del Ecuador*. 385 pp., annex. Ministerio de Educación, Quito.
- Verde, M.** 2000. Trazas fósiles de artrópodos en el Uruguay. *Abstracts, I Simpósio Brasileiro de Paleoartropodología, I Simpósio Sudamericano de Paleoartropodología, I International Meeting on Palearthropodology, Ribeirão Preto – SP, Brazil 3–8.9.2000*. Pages 112–113.
- Verde, M. & Genise, J.F.** 2007. Evolución de la icnofauna terrestre de la Patagonia Central IV. Formación Asencio del Terciario temprano de Uruguay: ¿El antecedente de la explosión del Eoceno medio en la Patagonia? *Resúmenes de la Quinta Reunión Argentina de Icnología y Tercera Reunión de Icnología del Mercosur. Ushuaia, Tierra del Fuego, Argentina*. 40 pp.
- Verde, M., Ubilla, M., Jiménez, J.J. & Genise, J.F.** 2007. A new earthworm trace fossil from paleosols: aestivation chambers from the Late Pleistocene Sopas Formation of Uruguay. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **243**: 339–347.

(2) J.F. Genise

Conicet, Museo Paleontológico Egidio Feruglio, Av. Fontana 140, 9100 Trelew, Chubut, Argentina (e-mail: jgenise@mef.org.ar)

J.H. Laza

Conicet, Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales, Av. Angel Gallardo 470, 1405 Buenos Aires, Argentina (e-mail: pepela@macn.gov.ar)

A.K. Rindsberg

Department of Biological & Environmental Sciences, Station 7, University of West Alabama, Livingston, Alabama 35470, U.S.A. (e-mail: arindsberg@uwa.edu)

We support the reversal of precedence of *Coprinisphaera* Sauer 1955 over *Fontanai* Roselli 1939 as proposed by Krell, instead of the conservation of the ichnogeneric name *Coprinisphaera* Sauer, 1955 by suppressing the senior synonym *Fontanai* Roselli, 1939 as proposed by Genise et al. (BZN **63**: 243–246), thus avoiding the suppression of a name that might represent a distinct ichnotaxon in a future refined ichnotaxonomy.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the usage of the generic name of *Drosophila* Fallén, 1823 (Insecta, Diptera)

(Case 3407; see BZN 64: 238–242)

Corrigendum

Please note that the correct date for Fallén's establishment of the name *Drosophila* is 1823, rather than 1832, as stated in the title and the abstract of the application published in BZN 64: 238–242.

(1) Andrew Polaszek

Department of Entomology, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e.mail: a.polaszek@nhm.ac.uk)

The case to conserve the usage of the name *Drosophila* Fallén, 1832 over *Sophophora* Sturtevant, 1939, for *Drosophila melanogaster*, is probably the most important ever to have been submitted for a ruling by the Commission in its 113-year history. *Drosophila melanogaster*, commonly referred to (especially by non-taxonomists) as simply '*Drosophila*', is the most widely studied animal, apart, possibly, from *Homo sapiens*, in human history. At the time of writing, 'Google' searches result in the following numbers of 'hits': *Drosophila*: 6,700,000; *Drosophila melanogaster*: 3,640,000; *Sophophora*: 19,000. Thus the number of hits for *Drosophila* exceeds that for *Sophophora* by more than 350 times. This comparison illustrates, very simply, the current global comparative usage of the two names.

It seems likely that were the Commission not to vote in support of the conservation of *Drosophila*, such action would lead not only to unprecedented nomenclatural instability, but also to a widespread lack of confidence in both the actions and the purpose of the Commission itself. While being far from perfect, the present code continues to provide stability, and is adhered to by almost the entire community of zoological taxonomists, while providing opportunities for dealing effectively with exceptional cases. *Drosophila* is just such an exception, and possibly the greatest test of the Commission's role and effectiveness since its formation in 1895.

(2) Amir Yassin

Département Systématique et Evolution, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle (MNHN), 18 rue Buffon, 75005 Paris, France
(e-mail: yassin@legs.cnrs-gif.fr)

The authors showed the invalidity of the early type designation of *Drosophila*: *Musca cellaris* Linnaeus, 1758 (p. 597) by Curtis, 1833 (p. 473) of which the systematic status has never been clarified (and thus invalid); and *Musca funebris* Fabricius, 1787 (p. 345) by Macquart, 1835 (p. 549) at the same time placed in synonymy with *M. cellaris* Linnaeus, 1758 (thus equally invalid). However, Zetterstedt's (1847, p. 2542) designation of *M. funebris* Fabricius, 1787 has been accepted by most subsequent taxonomists according to the Principle of the First Reviser (Article 24.2 of the Code – Determination by the First Reviser). Furthermore, *M. funebris* Fabricius, 1787 was transferred to *Drosophila* by the

author of the genus *Drosophila* Fallén, 1823 (p. 5), whereas *Drosophila melanogaster* Meigen, 1830 (p. 85) was described later. This can be taken as an additional taxonomic argument in favor of the preservation of *Musca funebris* Fabricius, 1787 as the type of the genus *Drosophila* Fallén than for *D. melanogaster* Meigen, 1830 (Article 23.1 of the Code—Statement of the Principle of Priority).

Drosophila is the nominotypical genus of the family DROSOPHILIDAE, and any change of the type designation of the genus would inevitably entail dramatic nomenclatural changes in the whole family (Article 36.2 of the Code – Type Genus). Although authors have attempted to make such changes on the basis of molecular phylogenetic studies, it is hard to think that a single application can resolve all nomenclatural problems in a group as large as the genus *Drosophila* (~1,500 spp.) of which molecular phylogenies are scarcely congruent (Ashburner et al., 2005). If the authors' propositions of the new generic names formed after the splitting of the current paraphyletic genus *Drosophila* were accepted, three out of the twelve model species with complete genome sequence of *Drosophila* would no longer carry the generic name *Drosophila*: namely, *D. virilis* Sturtevant, 1916 (p. 330), *D. mojavensis* Patterson in Patterson & Crow, 1940 (p. 251), and *D. grimshawi* (Oldenberg, 1914, p.23). Regarding the popularity of *Drosophila* as a model to biology grant agencies, biologists working on these species and on other related taxa (including *D. funebris*) would feel considerable injustice in comparison to biologists working on *Drosophila melanogaster*-related taxa. Although I totally agree with the authors that the current paraphyletic status of the genus *Drosophila* violates modern systematic practice, I urge that if a taxonomic change has to be made, it has to follow conventional taxonomic rules with an upgrading of the monophyletic subgenus *Sophophora*, of which *Drosophila melanogaster* is the type by original designation (Sturtevant, 1939, p. 140) to the rank of genus.

In conclusion, I hope that the Commission will maintain *Drosophila funebris* (Fabricius, 1787) as the type of the nominotypical genus *Drosophila* Fallén, 1823 following both the Principles of Priority and of First Reviser.

References

- Ashburner, M., Golic, K.G. & Hawley, R.S. 2005. *Drosophila. A laboratory handbook*. Second edition. 1409 pp. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press.
- Curtis, J. 1833. Pp. 434–481 in: *British entomology, being illustrations and descriptions of the genera of insects found in Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. 10. London.
- Fabricius, J.C. 1787. *Mantissa insectorum sistens species nuper detectas adiectis synonymis, observationibus, descriptionibus, emendationibus*, vol. 2. 381 pp. Hafniae.
- Fallén, C.F. 1823. *Diptera sveciae. Geomyzides*. 8 pp. Berlin.
- Linnaeus, C. 1758. *Systema Naturae*, Ed. 10, vol. 1. 824 pp. Salvii, Holmiae.
- Macquart, J.R. 1835. *Histoire naturelle des insectes, Diptères*, vol. ii. 703 pp. de Roret, Paris.
- Meigen, J.W. 1830. *Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zweiflügeligen Insekten*. 6 Theil. 401 pp. Schulze Buchhandlung, Hamm.
- Oldenberg, L. 1914. Beitrag zur Kenntnis der europäischen Drosophiliden (Dipt.). *Archiv für Naturgeschichte*, **80**(A)2: 1–42.
- Patterson, J.T. & Crow, J.F. 1940. Hybridisation in the *mulleri* group of *Drosophila*. *University of Texas Publications*, **4032**: 251–256.
- Sturtevant, A.H. 1916. Notes on North American Drosophilidae with descriptions of twenty-three new species. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, **9**: 323–343.
- Sturtevant, A.H. 1939. On the subdivision of the genus *Drosophila*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science of USA*, **25**: 137–141.

Zetterstedt, J.W. 1847. *Diptera scandinaviae disposita et descripta*, vol. 6. 417 pp. Lundberg, Lund.

(3) V. Sidorenko

Laboratory of Entomology, Institute of Biology and Soil Sciences, Vladivostok, 690022 Russia (e-mail: stegana@mail.ru)

In my opinion, if the Commission decides to support this application that would be against the rules of the Code and would create bad precedent.

Comment on the proposed suppression of *Gobius lagocephalus* Pallas, 1770

(Osteichthyes, Teleostei, GOBIIDAE)

(Case 3383; see BZN 64: 103–107)

Maurice Kottelat

Route de la Baroche 12, Cornol, CH-2952, Switzerland (address for correspondence); and Raffles Museum of Biodiversity Research, Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, 6 Science Drive 2, 03–01, Singapore 117546 (e-mail: mkottelat@dplanet.ch)

Helen K. Larson

Museum and Art Gallery of the Northern Territory, PO Box 4646, Darwin, NT 0801, Australia (e-mail: helen.larson@nt.gov.au)

Ron E. Watson

3658 NW 41st Lane, Gainesville, Florida 32605–1468, U.S.A. (e-mail: gobyresearch@cox.net)

Philippe Keith

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Laboratoire d'ichtyologie, CP 26, 57 rue Cuvier, 75231 Paris cedex 05, France (e-mail: keith@mnhn.fr)

We are writing to register our objection to the proposed suppression of the specific name *Gobius lagocephalus*. As will be pointed out, the proposal by Smith & Sparks (2007) omits facts that make the application pointless; the described problem does not exist and has been solved elsewhere; suppressing the name *G. lagocephalus* would negatively affect the name of a well known and widely distributed species without creating any benefit (the effect would be the reverse) to the nomenclature of this group of fishes.

In their proposal Smith & Sparks (2007) present as Option 2: ‘designating a neotype that is most consistent with current usage (as a species of *Sicyopterus*)’—this has already been done (Kottelat 2007). The preservation of the status quo with regard to the name *Gobius lagocephalus*, presently known widely as *Sicyopterus lagocephalus*, is desired for stability of nomenclature.

In their application, Smith & Sparks (2007) mention as holotype the specimen on which Pallas (1770) based his description and figure. They mention that this specimen is lost and refer to ‘Kottelat, in press’ as a source for this information. This

information was included in a manuscript not yet accepted for publication, and was used by Smith & Sparks without the author's knowledge. Smith & Sparks do not mention that this now published article (Kottelat, 2007; available online since June 2006) includes information and nomenclatural acts that show their application unnecessary and disagreeing with the facts.

Contrary to Smith & Sparks' (2007) comment, there is no holotype for *G. lagocephalus* but there are two syntypes. Besides the specimen in his possession, Pallas explicitly identified in his description of *G. lagocephalus* a specimen described and figured by Koelreuter (1764). This specimen is thus part of the type series. These two syntypes are now lost (Kottelat, 2007).

The two specimens (based on data in the descriptions and on the figures) are not conspecific (differences described by Kottelat, 2007 and Smith & Sparks, 2007). The only specimen that can be partly identified is that of Pallas, as his Figure 7 (Plate II) shows the single central lip cleft characteristic of the genus *Sicydium* (unless the artist overlooked the two lateral clefts of *Sicyopterus*, however, given the accuracy of the illustrations of the other fish on the plates, this is unlikely). The drawings of Koelreuter's specimen (Koelreuter, 1764: plate 9, figs 3–4) have not been done by such a skilled artist as was available for Pallas's fish (Pallas 1770: plate 2, figs 6–7) and cannot be identified to genus with any certainty, but it is clearly a sicydiine. The pectoral fin ray counts given by Koelreuter (15 rays) and Pallas (17 rays) are close to the lower end of the range of 17–21 pectoral fin rays for *Sicyopterus* and 17–22 for *Sicydium* (Watson, 2000; Watson et al., 2000; Larson, unpubl. data) and it is possible that both Koelreuter and Pallas missed seeing a fin ray or two (adult sicydiines have fleshy pectoral fins and even today with better equipment these rays are often overlooked).

Pallas's specimen was stated to be from 'America' and the origin of Koelreuter's specimen is unknown (Pallas wrote: 'ignorant of its native land' (our rough translation)). The original type locality therefore cannot be 'America' as this is the locality of only one of the two syntypes. Where Koelreuter obtained his fish from remains unknown.

There have already been two neotype designations for *Gobius lagocephalus* (Fricke, 1999; Watson et al., 2000), both invalid because the authors did not satisfy the conditions of Article 75.3 of the Code, especially clause 75.3.4, which requires information on the lost type material and efforts made to locate it. This is discussed by Kottelat (2007) and Smith & Sparks (2007). Both Fricke's and Watson et al.'s neotype designations were based on specimens from Réunion Island, linking the name to the species known under that name since 1842, thus attempting to preserve stability of nomenclature.

Kottelat (2007) discussed the situation, discussed his attempts to locate the syntypes and their absence and designated a neotype satisfying the criteria of Article 75.3 of the Code. To minimize the risk of future confusion, he designated as neotype the specimen (SMF 28571) previously invalidly designated by Watson et al. (2000). With this neotype designation the name *G. lagocephalus* is definitively linked with the species recognised under this name since 1842 and the type locality is now Ravine St. Gilles on Réunion Island.

Smith & Sparks' argument seems to center around the type locality of *G. lagocephalus*, which they consider as 'America' alone, and they perceive that a

neotype would have been from 'America', thus threatening the generic name *Sicydium* presently used for for at least 17 North and South American species. To 'rescue' the stability of the nomenclature of the American genus name *Sicydium* (and of the Mascarene endemic *Cotylopus*), they choose the alternative to destabilize the nomenclature in use in the Indo-West Pacific. On the other hand, this potential problem was pointed out by Kottelat (2007) and his approach was to designate a neotype that consolidates the present use of the species and at the same time preserves the use of *Sicydium* and *Cotylopus*.

The name *G. lagocephalus* (now *Sicyopterus lagocephalus*) has been continuously used since 1842 for a fish species distributed along the coasts and islands of the Indian Ocean and the Western Pacific Ocean, from Madagascar to southern Japan and New Guinea (Watson et al., 2000). Some authors do not recognise the different populations throughout this area as conspecific and consider *S. lagocephalus* to be restricted to Madagascar, the Mascarene Islands and the east coast of Africa. But all have used the name as valid for a species within this area. Further, the species called *S. lagocephalus* has a commercial value, as the fish is a local delicacy on Réunion Island. We have decided not to count usages of the name *S. lagocephalus*, we need only to mention that it is cited in all the classical as well as recent faunal works of that area; some examples: Boulenger (1916), Smith (1959), Teugels et al. (1985), Daget et al. (1986), Bauchot et al. (1988), Balon & Bruton (1994), Keith et al. (1999), Watson et al. (2000), Allen et al. (2002), Nakabo (2002), Senou et al. (2004), Keith et al. (2005) and Hoese & Larson (2006). It also seems sufficient to state that the only authors we are aware of who have not considered *S. lagocephalus* as valid (and *nolens volens* disturbed stability of nomenclature) were Sparks & Nelson (2004) and now Smith & Sparks (2007).

In order to preserve the stability of nomenclature we recommend that the Commission rejects this unnecessary application. The Commission is further asked:

- (1) to place on the Official List of Available Names in Zoology the name *lagocephalus* Pallas, 1770, as published in the binomen *Gobius lagocephalus*;
- (2) to confirm the designation of specimen SMF 28571 as the neotype of *Gobius lagocephalus* Pallas, 1770, as designated in Kottelat (2007).

Kottelat's (2007) paper is held by the Secretariat and forms an integral part of this comment.

Additional references

- Allen, G.R., Midgley, S.H. & Allen, M. 2002. *Field guide to the freshwater fishes of Australia*. xiv, 394 pp. Western Australian Museum, Perth.
- Balon, E.K. & Bruton, M.N. 1994. Fishes of the Tatinga River, Comoros, with comments on freshwater amphidromy in the goby *Sicyopterus lagocephalus*. *Ichthyological Exploration of Freshwaters*, **5** (1): 25–40.
- Bauchot, M.-L., Desoutter, M., Hoese, D.F. & Larson, H.K. 1991. Catalogue critique des types des poissons du Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle. (Suite) Sous-ordre des Gobioidi. *Bulletin du Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 4e Série*, **13** (1–2): 1–82.
- Boulenger, G.A. 1916. *Catalogue of the fresh-water fishes of Africa in the British Museum (Natural History)*. Vol. 4. Longmans, Green and Co., London.
- Daget, J., Gosse, J.-P. & Thys van den Audenaerde, D.F.E. (Eds.). 1986. *Checklist of the freshwater fishes of Africa. CLOFFA*. Vol. 2, xiv, 520 pp. ISNB, Brussels, MRAC, Tervuren, and ORSTOM, Paris.

- Hoese, D.F. & Larson, H.K.** 2006. Gobiidae. Gobies. Pp. 1612–1697 in Hoese, D.F., Bray, D.J., Paxton, J.R. & Allen, G.R. Fishes. In: Beesley, P.L. & Wells, A. (Eds.). *Zoological catalogue of Australia. Volume 35. Parts 1–3*. ABRS and CSIRO Publishing, Canberra.
- Keith, P., Vigneux, E. & Bosc, P.** 1999. *Atlas des poissons et des crustacés d'eau douce de la Réunion*. Patrimoines naturels, vol. 39, 138 pp. Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.
- Kottelat, M.** 2007. Nomenclatural status and identity of *Gobius lagocephalus* (Teleostei: Gobiidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **43**: 693–695.
- Nakabo, T.** (Ed.). 2002. *Fishes of Japan with pictorial keys to the species, English edition*. Vol. 2, vii, 867 pp. Tokai University Press, Kanagawa.
- Pallas, P.S.** 1770. *Spicilegia Zoologica quibus novae imprimis et obscurae animalium species iconibus, descriptionibus atque commentariis illustrantur*. Fasciculus octavus. 54 pp., 4 pls. Lange, Berlin.
- Senou, H., Suzuki, T., Shibukawa, K. & Yano, K.** 2004. *A photographic guide to the gobioid fishes of Japan*. 536 pp. Heibonsha, Tokyo.
- Smith, J.L.B.** 1959. Gobioid fishes of the families Gobiidae, Periophthalmidae, Trypauchenidae, Taenioididae and Kraemeriidae of the western Indian Ocean. *Ichthyological Bulletin, Smith Institute, Rhodes University*, **13**: 185–225.
- Smith, W.L. & Sparks, J.S.** 2007. *Gobius lagocephalus*: the world's most widespread *nomen dubium*. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **43**: 696–698.
- Teugels, G.G., Janssens, L.J.M., Bogaert, J. & Dumalin, M.** 1985. Sur une collection de poissons de rivière des Comores. *Cybium*, **9**(1): 41–56.
- Watson, R.E.** 2000. *Sicydium* from the Dominican Republic with description of a new species (Teleostei: Gobiidae). *Stuttgarter Beiträge zur Naturkunde, Serie A (Biologie)*, **608**: 1–31.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Buettneria* Case, 1922 (Amphibia)
(Case 3420; see BZN **64**: 252–254)

(1) Gilles Cuny

The Natural History Museum of Denmark, Øster Voldgade 5–7, 1350 Copenhagen, Denmark (e-mail: Gilles@snm.ku.dk)

I am writing to support the application of Lucas et al. (2007) (Case 3420) to conserve the long- and widely-used name of the Triassic amphibian *Buettneria* Case, 1922. This name is a homonym of a little-used name of an insect (*Buettneria* Karsch, 1888), and abandoning it would destabilise the nomenclature of this amphibian group. To serve the stability and universality of zoological nomenclature, the name *Buettneria* Karsch, 1888 should be suppressed, and the name *Buettneria* Case, 1922 should be conserved.

(2) Robert M. Sullivan

Section of Paleontology and Geology, The State Museum of Pennsylvania, 300 North Street, Harrisburg, PA 17120, U.S.A. (e-mail: rsullivan@state.pa.us)

I support the application of Lucas et al. (2007) to conserve the long- and widely-used name of the Late Triassic metoposaurid amphibian *Buettneria* Case, 1922. *Buettneria* is one of the few Mesozoic vertebrates known from Pennsylvania that is represented by cranial and postcranial remains. As such, this metoposaurid has been the subject of much interest on the national, international and local levels (Kochanov & Sullivan, 1994; Lucas & Sullivan, 1996; Sullivan et al., 1995). It is also

a name that is widely used in many museum exhibits where material of this metoposaurid is on display. Abandoning this well known, and widely used, name because it is the homonym of a little-used, and arguably obscure, name of an insect (*Buettneria* Karsch, 1888), only serves to destabilize zoological nomenclature. Thus, the name *Buettneria* Karsch, 1888 should be suppressed, and the name *Buettneria* Case, 1922 should be conserved.

References

- Kochanov, W.E. & Sullivan, R.M. 1994. Finding phytosaurs in Pennsylvania: the story of Stahle, Sinclair, and Zions View. *Pennsylvania Geology*, **25**(1): 3–8.
- Lucas, S.G. & Sullivan, R.M. 1996. Fossils provide a Pennsylvania standard for part of Late Triassic time. *Pennsylvania Geology*, **27**(4): 8–13.
- Sullivan, R.M., Lucas, S.G. & Randal, K.A. 1995. Late Triassic vertebrate fauna from the Zions View locality (Little Conewago Creek), York County, Pennsylvania. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, **15**, Supplement to no. 3, 55A. (abstract).

(3) Claudia A. Marsicano

Departamento de Cs. Geologicas, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina (e-mail: claumar@gl.fcen.uba.ar)

I support the application of Lucas et al. (2007) to conserve the long- and widely-used name of the Triassic amphibian *Buettneria* Case, 1922. Abandoning this name in favour of a little-used name of an insect (*Buettneria* Karsch, 1888) would lead to a considerable confusion in the nomenclature. To maintain the stability and universality of zoological nomenclature, the name *Buettneria* Karsch, 1888 should be suppressed, and the name *Buettneria* Case, 1922 should be conserved.

(4) Bernhard Hausdorf

Zoological Museum of the University of Hamburg, Martin-Luther-King-Platz 3, 20146 Hamburg, Germany (e-mail: Hausdorf@zoologie.uni-hamburg.de)

When proposing to conserve the name of the Triassic amphibian genus *Buettneria* Case, 1922 by suppressing the senior homonym *Buettneria* Karsch, 1889 (Insecta, Orthoptera), Lucas et al. (2007) failed to notice that there is another senior homonym, *Buettneria* Simroth, 1888 (Mollusca, Gastropoda). Simroth (1910) replaced the supposedly preoccupied name *Buettneria* Simroth, 1888 by *Buettnerella* Simroth, 1910. However, as already noted by van Goethem (1977), the description of Karsch was published only at the beginning of February 1889, whereas the paper of Simroth (1888) had been published on 20th February 1888. *Buettneria* Simroth, 1888 is in current use for African land snails. The junior homonym *Buettneria* Karsch, 1889 has to be replaced by its junior subjective synonym *Stenacropteryx* Karsch, 1896. I do not think that the use of the plenary power to suppress the generic names *Buettneria* Simroth, 1888 and *Buettneria* Karsch, 1889 would be justified to conserve the junior homonym *Buettneria* Case, 1922. Rather, *Buettneria* Case, 1922 can be replaced by *Koskinonodon* Branson and Mehl, 1929 as proposed by Mueller (2007) without threatening the stability or universality of nomenclature.

Additional references

- Simroth, H.** 1888. Über die azorisch-portugiesische Nacktschneckenfauna und ihre Beziehungen (Vorläufige Mittheilung). *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, **11**: 86–90.
- Simroth, H.** 1910. Lissopode Nacktschnecken von Madagaskar, den Comoren und Mauritius. Unter Berücksichtigung verwandter Arten. Pp. 576–622, pl. 25–26 in Voeltzkow, A. (Ed.), *Reise in Ostafrika in den Jahren 1903–1905. Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse*, vol. 2. Schweizerbart, Stuttgart.
- Van Goethem, L.** 1977. Révision systématique des Urocyclinae (Mollusca, Pulmonata, Urocyclidae). *Musee Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren, Belgique, Annales, Sciences Zoologiques*, **218**: I–XI, 1–355.

Comment on the proposed precedence of *Chelodina rugosa* Ogilby, 1890 (currently *Macrochelodina rugosa*; Reptilia, Testudines) over *Chelodina oblonga* Gray, 1841 (Case 3351; see BZN **63: 187–193, **64**: 68, 127–128)**

Uwe Fritz

*Museum of Zoology, Natural History State Collections Dresden,
A. B. Meyer Building, D-01109 Dresden, Germany
(e-mail: uwe.fritz@snsd.smwk.sachsen.de)*

I write in support of the proposed precedence of *Chelodina rugosa* Ogilby, 1890 over *Chelodina oblonga* Gray, 1841 for the reasons specified in Case 3351 and Thomson's (2007) Comment (BZN **64**: 127–128). Further, I support usage of the name *Chelodina colliei* Gray, 1856 for the species known under the misapplied name *Chelodina oblonga* Gray, 1841 for the past 40 years (see Case 3351). When it is considered that the same species was correctly named *Chelodina colliei* Gray, 1856 for 136 years, perpetuating the misapplication seems to be a bad choice, although Savage (2007, BZN **64**: 68) suggested this by his application to the Commission to set aside all previous designations of type specimen for *Chelodina oblonga* Gray, 1841 and to designate as its neotype BMNH 1947.3.5.91, the lectotype of *Chelodina colliei* Gray, 1856. However, Savage (2007) overlooked the long correct usage of *Chelodina colliei* Gray, 1856 (see Thomson's reply in BZN **64**: 127–128).

In conclusion, the suggestions and considerations in Thomson's Case 3351 and Comment in BZN **64**: 127–128 seem reasonable and the best solution to a nomenclatural problem. Therefore, the name *Chelodina colliei* was already accepted in the recently published 'Checklist of Chelonians of the World' (Fritz & Havaš 2007, *Vertebrate Zoology* **57**: 149–368), serving as standard reference for CITES.

Though, the matter became somewhat more complicated in the meantime. In a hobbyist journal, McCord & Joseph-Ouni (2007, *Reptilia* **52**: 56–64) 'rejected' the holotype of *Chelodina oblonga* Gray, 1841 and designated the lectotype of *Chelodina colliei* Gray, 1856 as neotype of *Chelodina oblonga* Gray, 1841, thereby repeating the arguments of Savage (2007) without mentioning Savage's Comment in the BZN. It is obvious from Article 75.6 of the Code that for such action the plenary power of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is needed. Therefore, the lectotype designation by McCord & Joseph-Ouni (2007) is invalid and unwelcome, contributing only to further confusion.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Atractus* Wagler, 1828 and *Atractus trilineatus* Wagler, 1828 (Reptilia, Serpentes)

(Case 3365; see BZN 64: 60–63)

Charles W. Myers

*Department of Herpetology, American Museum of Natural History,
New York, NY, U.S.A. (e-mail: myers@amnh.org)*

Walter E. Schargel

*Department of Biology, The University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington,
TX 76019, U.S.A. (e-mail: wschargel@yahoo.com)*

As concerned taxonomists who separately and collaboratively continue to publish on *Atractus* we strongly support conservation of this name as proposed by Hoogmoed & Savage (BZN 64: 60–63). The senior name *Brachyura* Kuhl & van Hasselt, 1822 has not been used for well over a century and is virtually forgotten. The name *Atractus* Wagler, 1828, on the other hand is recognized by a wide range of biologists, inasmuch as it applies to the largest genus of colubrid snakes in the New World.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of *Columba roseogrisea* Sundevall, 1857
(currently *Streptopelia roseogrisea*; Aves, COLUMBIDAE)**

(Case 3380: see BZN 64: 108–112, 118–122)

Thomas M. Donegan

*ProAves Foundation, 33 Blenheim Road, Caversham, Reading, U.K.
(e-mail: thomasdonegan@yahoo.co.uk)*

I noted in Case 3380 that the wild and domestic species names given to the chicken *Gallus domesticus* and red junglefowl *Gallus gallus* may require Commission attention in future. However, the name *Gallus gallus* (Linnaeus, 1758, p. 158), which is usually applied to the red junglefowl, is senior to the name sometimes given to the domestic chicken *Gallus domesticus* (Gmelin, 1789, p. 737). Widespread usage of '*Gallus domesticus* (Linnaeus, 1758)' or '*Gallus gallus domesticus* (Linnaeus, 1758)' in recent ornithological literature and perpetuated in Case 3380 is an incorrect citation.

The relative priority of *Gallus gallus* and *Gallus domesticus* (in the context of wild and domestic names) does not require the Commission's attention because the species name for the wild population is senior to the species name for the domestic population. If the two names are considered synonymous or a trinomial is used, the wild species name *Gallus gallus* (Linnaeus, 1758) has priority under the Principle of Priority (Article 23.1 of the Code).

The above matter was mentioned only by way of introduction in Case 3380 and does not affect the facts or recommendations in Case 3380.